

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in this application, with claim 1 being amended by this response.

Rejection of Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liwerant et al. (US 2005/0246752).

The present invention provides a method and apparatus for sharing information in a network. A user is enabled to define a data segment and the defined data segment is recorded at one of a plurality of user systems connected to the network. The first information identifying the defined data segment is transmitted to a remote location. The first information is data other than the defined data segment. Second information identifying the defined data segment and other than the data segment is received from the remote location, at each of the plurality of user systems connected to the network. Independent claims 1, 9 and 14 include features similar to those discussed above.

The present claimed invention relates to a system for reducing the required bandwidth when sharing video data. A user identifies a data segment to be recorded on a user system and transmits identifying information to a remote central server. The remote central server then records the information identifying the video data segment. The remote central server then transmits identifying information to each of the user systems connected to the network. In this way the video data is only transmitted over the network from the user system on which when a user wishes to access that data. Thus, the present claimed invention minimizes the bandwidth needed to transmit an entire data segment for sharing with other user systems connected to the network.

Liwerant et al. describe a system for sharing video data over a network. The video input device may be a web camera, computer or VCR (paragraph 0010). The video data is uploaded from the video input device onto "a video server...[where it can

be] accessed by any number of viewers...[using] an identifier of the video” (paragraph 0006).

The Office Action asserts that Liwerant et al. record a defined data segment. However, Liwerant et al. describe the recording of an **undefined** data segment. In contrast to the present claimed invention, Liwerant et al. do not define a data segment before recording it. Liwerant et al. merely describe an identification tag containing information to access the video data after recording (paragraph 0006). This is wholly unlike the present claimed invention which uses identifying information to define the data to be recorded and accessed. Therefore, Liwerant et al. neither disclose nor suggest “recording the defined data segment” as recited in claims 1, 9 and 14 of the present invention.

The Office Action further asserts that Liwerant et al. record a data segment at a user system connected to the network. However, Liwerant et al. describe recording the undefined data segment at a user system **not connected to the network** (paragraph 00010). After the video is recorded it is uploaded to a user system connected to the network. In fact, the process of uploading the recorded video data onto the network requires a large amount of bandwidth. This is contrary to the objective of the present claimed invention. The present claimed invention transmits identifying information so that the data segment can be recorded directly onto the network without using a large amount of bandwidth. Therefore, Liwerant et al. neither disclose nor suggest “recording the defined data segment **at one of a plurality of user systems connected to the network**” as recited in claims 1, 9 and 14 of the present invention.

As claims 2-6, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 15-17 are each dependent on one of Independent claims 1, 9 and 14 it is respectfully submitted these claims are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above regarding the rejection of claims 1, 9 and 14.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure in Liwerant et al. showing the above discussed features of independent claims 1, 9 and 14. It is further

respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 are not anticipated by Liwerant et al. It is thus respectfully submitted that this rejection is satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7, 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 7, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liwerant et al. in view of Moynihan (US 2002/0056119 A1).

Moynihan describes a method and system for transferring multimedia files to a central server where the files can be readily accessed by other users on the network. Moynihan provides a way for users on a network to organize, edit, index, host and display multimedia files on a central server, while preserving control over how and to whom the files are displayed. Once the multimedia is published, integrated tools to manage, publicize, edit, charge for and control access to the multimedia are provided.

The Office Action asserts that Moynihan discloses transmitting data in accordance with a predefined time schedule. However, Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al., is not concerned with defining a data segment to be recorded at a user system connected to the network. In fact, Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al., describe uploading the video data onto a central server. This action requires a large bandwidth. This is contrary to the object of the present claimed invention, which reduces the bandwidth required. Therefore, Moynihan, similarly to Liwerant et al., neither discloses nor suggests "recording the defined data segment at one of a plurality of user systems connected to the network" as recited in claims 1, 9 and 14 of the present invention.

The Office Action further asserts that the combination of the systems of Liwerant et al. and Moynihan would disclose the features of the present claimed invention. However, as discussed above, both Liwerant et al. and Moynihan neither disclose nor suggest "recording the defined data segment at one of a plurality of user systems connected to the network" as recited in claims 1, 9 and 14 of the present

Serial No. 10/025,161

PU010318

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Barry Jay Weber

By: 

Jack Schwartz

Reg. No. 34,721

Tel. No. (609) 734-6866

Thomson Licensing Inc.
Patent Operations
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312
June 13, 2006



Serial No. 10/025,161

PU010318

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: June 13, 2006